

Filed in open court this 27<sup>th</sup> day of May 2016  
JMS.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ART+COM Innovationpool GmbH.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No. 14-cv-217-TBD
	)	
vs.	)	<b>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</b>
	)	
GOOGLE INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

2016 MAY 27 PM 2:05  
RECEIVED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

BN

**VERDICT FORM**

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below. Please answer each and every question on this verdict form, unless otherwise directed. As used herein, "ACI" means ART+COM Innovationpool GmbH. As used herein, "Google" means Google Inc.

**QUESTION NO. 1**

Do you find that ACI has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Google's use of the accused Google Earth products infringes the following claims of U.S. Patent No. Re 44,550?

	YES (for ACI)	NO (for Google)
Claim 1		✓
Claim 3		✓
Claim 14		✓
Claim 28		✓

**QUESTION NO. 2**

Do you find that Google has proven by clear and convincing evidence that SRI's TerraVision system was publicly used before December 17, 1995?

YES (for Google) ✓ NO (for ACI) \_\_\_\_\_

**QUESTION NO. 3**

If you answered yes to Question No. 2, do you find that Google has proven by clear and convincing evidence that SRI's TerraVision system anticipates (that is, constitutes a public use of) any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. Re 44,550?

	YES (for Google)	NO (for ACI)
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 3	✓	
Claim 14	✓	
Claim 28	✓	

**QUESTION NO. 4**

If you answered yes to Question No. 2 and no to Question No. 3, do you find that Google has proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. Re 44,550 are invalid as obvious based on SRI's TerraVision system and the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention?

	YES (for Google)	NO (for ACI)
Claim 1		
Claim 3		
Claim 14		
Claim 28		

N/A

**QUESTION NO. 5**

Do you find that Google has proven by clear and convincing evidence that the T\_Vision Paper was a printed publication before December 17, 1995?

YES (for Google) ✓ NO (for ACI) \_\_\_\_\_

**QUESTION NO. 6**

If you answered yes to Question No. 5, do you find that Google has proven by clear and convincing evidence that the T\_Vision Paper system anticipates any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. Re 44,550?

	YES (for Google)	NO (for ACI)
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 14	✓	
Claim 28	✓	

**QUESTION NO. 7**

If you answered yes to Question No. 5 and no to Question No. 6, do you find that Google has proven by clear and convincing evidence any of the following claims of U.S. Patent No. Re 44,550 are invalid as obvious based on the T\_Vision Paper system and the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention?

	YES (for Google)	NO (for ACI)
Claim 1		
Claim 14		
Claim 28		

N/A

**QUESTION NO. 8**

If you answered yes to Question No. 5, do you find that Google has proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim 3 of U.S. Patent No. Re 44,550 is invalid as obvious in view of the combination of the T\_Vision Paper, the Global Mapping Patent, and the knowledge and skill of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the alleged invention?

	YES (for Google)	NO (for ACI)
Claim 3	✓	

**QUESTION NO. 9**

*Please answer this question only if you have found at least one of claims 1, 3, 14, and 28 to have been proved infringed by ACI and not proved invalid by Google.*

What is the amount of reasonable royalty damages you have determined for Google's infringement of U.S. Patent No. Re 44,550?

\$ N/A

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. The Foreperson should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below and notify the Court Security Officer that you have reached a verdict. The Foreperson should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

DATED: May 27, 2016

       /        /         
       /        /